AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Three sheets of replacement drawings are being submitted herewith. Drawing sheet 1 has not been substantively amended, but is being supplied to provide a better copy for use in subsequent publishing. Drawing sheets 2 and 3 include changes to Figs. 2 and 3 to replace the term "voice recognition" with "speech recognition" in elements 205 and 235 of Fig. 2 and element 119 of Fig. 3 as requested by the Examiner. Approval of these drawing changes is requested.

REMARKS

This response is being filed in reply to the Office Action mailed March 21, 2007. In that Office Action, Figures 2 and 3 were objected to because of the term "voice recognition." Figs. 2 and 3 have been amended to replace the term "voice recognition" with "speech recognition" in elements 205 and 235 of Fig. 2 and element 119 of Fig. 3.

The specification was also objected to because of the term "voice recognition." The specification, including the abstract, has been amended to replace the term "voice recognition" with the term "speech recognition" as requested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-18 were objected to because of the term "voice recognition." Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-4, 9, and 14 were rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by Turnbull et al (U.S. Patent 6,980,092). Claims 5, 10, and 15 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turnbull in view of Pellom et al ("University of Colorado Dialog Systems for Travel and Navigation, 2001). Claims 6, 11, and 16 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turnbull in view of Duvall (U.S. Patent 5,704,008). Claims 7, 12, and 17 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turnbull in view of Majaniemi (U.S. Patent 6,393,403). Claims 8, 13, and 18 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turnbull in view of Yamamoto et al (U.S. Patent 6,778,963).

Claims 1-18 are now being cancelled and replaced with new claims 19-38. Accordingly, claims 19-38 are pending in the application. No new matter has been added or claimed, and each of the new claims is properly supported by the disclosure of the application as originally filed.

Claim 19 recites a method for selective vehicle accessory component control. The method utilizes a speech recognition engine of a vehicle telematics unit that receives a voice command to disable one or more features on a vehicle accessory component while leaving the vehicle ignition active. The voice command is verified that it is a valid voice command. In response to the verified voice command, at least one feature on the

vehicle accessory component is disabled such that the feature(s) cannot be activated until an enable command is received at the vehicle accessory component. The method provides the advantage of enabling a user to selectively disable features on a vehicle accessory component, such as on the vehicle's phone, audio system, vehicle navigation system, and the like while still allowing other systems on the vehicle to continue functioning, such as the vehicle ignition. As discussed in the application, this can be useful in situations such as when a vehicle owner allows others to use the vehicle or when the owner uses a valet service.

Claim 27 recites a method for selective vehicle accessory component control in which a voice command is received at a speech recognition engine of a vehicle telematics unit to enable one or more features on a vehicle accessory component. The received command is verified that it is a valid voice command and a verification is made that the feature(s) of the vehicle accessory component are currently disabled. If so, the feature is enabled. This method is particularly useful where a feature of a vehicle accessory has been previously disabled and a user wishes to enable the feature. In dependent claims 28 and 29, the method further verifies that the user requesting to enable the feature is authorized to do so.

Claim 34 recites a method for selective vehicle accessory component control in which a voice command is received at a speech recognition engine of a vehicle telematics unit to disable at least one feature on a vehicle accessory component while leaving the vehicle ignition active. Verification is made that the voice command was received from an authorized user. The received voice command is processed into a vehicle accessory control command that is routed to a control entity for the vehicle accessory component based upon a selection table comparison. The at least one feature on the vehicle accessory component is disabled by executing the vehicle accessory control command, wherein the at least one feature cannot be activated until an enable command is received at the vehicle accessory component. The method restricts unauthorized users from disabling the feature. Moreover, use of the selection table allows the speech recognition system to handle voice commands, translate the command to a command recognized by a corresponding control entity, and route the command to the proper control entity.

Prior Claim Rejections

Claims 1-18 have been cancelled so the objection and rejections of those claims are moot. Although claims 1-18 have been cancelled, the cancellation of these claims is without disclaimer of the subject matter thereof and without prejudice to Applicants' right to later pursue the subject matter of those claims in this or another application.

With regard to the new claims, the prior art of record does not disclose or render obvious the subject matter of independent claims 19, 27, and 34. Turnbull discloses a telematics system that addresses the problem of installing the system in a vehicle while utilizing minimum wiring (Abstract). The telematics system may incorporate a cellular telephone, Bluetooth transceiver, microphone processor, and voice recognition circuit in a common accessory (col. 29, lns. 56-60). The voice recognition system may be used to perform voice recognition functions that assist an automated call answering system (col. 29, lns. 64-67). However, Turnbull does not disclose receiving a voice command to disable or enable one or more features on a vehicle accessory component, much less while leaving the vehicle ignition active.

Also, according to the last Office Action, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Turnbull with that of Duvall. However, with respect to the new claims, Duvall does not overcome the deficiencies of Turnbull. Although Duvall discloses enabling and disabling a security system to enable or disable the vehicle's ignition (col. 4, lns. 8-29), Duvall does not enable or disable at least one feature on a vehicle accessory component while the ignition remains active. Duvall does not identify or address the problem of selectively enabling or disabling vehicle accessory features. Rather Duvall is focused merely on vehicle security, which involves enabling or disabling the ignition so that the vehicle cannot be driven by an unauthorized user. Duvall does not teach disabling selectable features of vehicle accessories so that an authorized driver can drive the vehicle but not access vehicle accessory features disabled by an authorized user.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19, 27, and 34 each patentably define over the prior art. Claims 20-26, 28-33, and 35-38 each ultimately depend from respective claims 19, 27, and 34 and should be allowed therewith.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable. Reconsideration is therefore requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if doing so would advance prosecution of this case.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0960 for any required fees or to credit that same deposit account with any overpayment associated with this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

REISING, ETHINGTON, BARNES, KISSELLE, P.C.

/James D. Stevens/

James D. Stevens
Registration No. 35,691
P.O. Box 4390
Troy, Michigan 48099
(248) 689-3500

Date: August 21, 2007
JDS/GGB